DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 939 CS 006 032

AUTHOR Bloome, David
TITLE Reading and Writing in a Classroom: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Students; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Observation Techniques; Cultural Influences; *Educational Research; Ethnography; Junior High Schools; Language Processing; Social Studies; *Sociolinguistics; *Student Behavior; *Writing (Composition); *Written Language

ABSTRACT

A study of the written language that was produced within one junior high school social studies classroom over a 38-minute period was based on the assumptions that (1) written language is not only affected by the context of the communicative event in which it is involved, but is also involved in the construction of the communicative event; (2) the learning of the written language of the classroom can be conceptualized as consisting of three components--the development of written language communicative competence, learning the forms of classroom written language behavior, and learning about the written language of the classroom; and (3) the learning of language does not occur separately from the learning of thought. A microanalytic description of three different written language events from the social studies classroom revealed an emphasis on procedural aspects for completing the instructional task. Students were observed to have learned the procedures of the patterns but not how the patterns were used to communicate across space and time. It appeared that reading or written language was, in effect, a set of procedures one enacts. The study suggests that students learn a "cultural stance" toward the written language (and communication in general) of their culture. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED200939

READING AND WRITING IN A CLASSROOM:

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Bloome

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

David Bloome

Department of Specialized Instructional Programs

Cleveland State University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Partial support for the research reported in this paper was provided by the National Institute of Education.

CS806032

1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 RATIONALE
1.2 ASSUMPTIONS
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN A SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON
2.1 THE SURFACE LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON
2.2 THE MICROANALYTIC DESCRIPTION OF THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON
2.21 THE NATURE OF THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: SOCIOLINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY
2.22 THE NATURE OF THE MICROANALYTIC DESCRIPTION
2.23 MICROANALYTIC PATTERNS OF WRITTEN LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR FROM A SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON
2.231 WRITTEN LANGUAGE DURING INSTRUCTION
2.232 WRITTEN LANGUAGE DURING THE REVIEW SEGMENT
2.3 DISCUSSION OF THE MICROANALYTIC PATTERNS
3.0 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this paper I would like to share a "look" at one junior high school social studies classroom, and, at the nature of written language within that one thirty-eight minute period. The data about this classroom comes from a larger sociolinguistic ethnographic study of the reading activities of a small group of Black junior high school students in an urban school system. However, before describing the data, I would like to discuss the rationale for my interest in this area, and, I would also like to present some of the assumptions upon which the research and its interpretation were based.

1.1 RATIONALE

By admitting some of the goals I had in pursuing this research, I hope to reveal any bias I may have had in the collection and interpretation of the data, and, I hope to provide a framework for the discussion that follows. Typically, reading and writing research have been concerned with the development of reading and writing proficiency. While I admit to sharing some of that concern, my primary interest in this area is to examine one component of the enculturation process.

Briefly, the enculturation process is the way in which adult members of a society make their children full members of the culture and/or society. Not only does the enculturation process involve the child's acquisition of values and customs, but more importantly, it involves the acquisition of ways of thinking, ways of using language, ways of organizing one's behavior, and, the learning of what constitutes appropriate social behavior in a variety of situations.

There seems to be a numbers of researchers and theorists who have called for an examination of child language development from this perspective (Mishler 1972; Schwartz 1981; Halliday 1975; Vygotsky 1962). In addition, there seems to be a number of ethnographic and sociolinguistic studies that also seem to be looking

at language from this perspective (Scollon and Scollon, in press; Michaels 1980; Tannen 1980; Florio and Shultz 1979; Erickson and Shultz 1981; Gumperz 1981; Cook-Gumperz 1981; Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz 1976; among others. See Bloome and Green, in press, for a review of sociolinguistic and ethnographic research in this area). Most of these studies are based on cross-cultural perspectives. These cross-cultural perspectives may involve interethnic issues (such as the work of Scollon and Scollon, in press, on Athabaskan Native Americans and Anglo school personnel); or, the cross-cultural perspective may focus on the transition from child culture to adult culture (such as the work of Cook-Gumperz 1981; Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz 1976).

1.2 ASSUMPTIONS

While space does not permit a listing of all of the assumptions made in the research study, it is important to list the major assumptions. These assumptions are consistent with recent research in sociolinguistic ethnography (i.e. Green and Wallat 1981; Hymes 197 ; Erickson and Shultz 1981) and classroom language research (i.e. Cazden, John, and, Hymes 1972). As with the rationale, above, the assumptions presented here provide a framework for presenting and interpreting the data.

The first assumption is that written language (reading and writing) is not only affected by the context of the communicative event in which it is involved, but, written language is also involved in the construction of the communicative event. In other words, the nature of written language, as a cognitive-linguistic process is affected by the nature of the context in which written language is used; and, written language is used as part of the process in constructing a communicative context. I define context similarly to McDermott (1976), Erickson and Shultz (1977) and Gumperz (1976) in the sense that contexts are constructed by what people do in interaction with each other. That is, the actions and reactions of people to each other becomes the context of the event through which participants indicate their intentions and interpret the behavior of others. The context of an event

is not static, nor predetermined (although participants may come to the event with expectations about the nature of the event and what would constitute appropriate behavior in the event); but rather, contexts continue to evolve as the participants continue to interact. Thus, in examining written language, one has to look not only at the printed discourse, but at the contexts in which written language is used and at how written language is used in constructing a context for social interaction.

The second assumption concerns the nature of learning the written language of the classroom. As a heuristic device, learning the written language of the classroom can be conceptualized as consisting of three components (based on Halliday's discussion of the components of learning language, 1980). The three components are -

1. The development of written language communicative competence, or, learning how to effectively and appropriately use written language in the classroom;
2. Learning the forms of classroom written language behavior; and,
3. Learning about the written language of the classroom.

The first component, learning how to use written language in the classroom appropriately, involves learning to "read" the communicative demands of the various situations within the classroom and responding appropriately with written language. The second component, learning the forms of classroom written language behavior involves learning not only the nature of the different genres of classroom written language (i.e. heading on the paper, short answer, essay) but also learning what verbal, nonverbal, and, paralinguistic behaviors need to accompany the use of written language. Since, as Heap (1980) suggests , what counts as reading is determined by resultant behaviors, one component of learning the written language of the classroom involves learning what behaviors count as reading - or as writing - within the various situations in the classroom. The third component, learning about

the written language of the classroom, involves acquisition of the metalinguistic concepts about reading and writing that are operant in the classroom.

The third major assumption made in this paper concerns the relationship between the learning of language and the learning of thought. The learning of language, whether written language, oral language, classroom language, or, other language) does not occur separately from the learning of thought. By thought, I am not referring to thinking (the acquisition of cogntive processes). Rather, I am referring to the shared cogntive constructs held by members of a culture or society. By thought, I am referring to what Vygotsky (1962) calls "scientific concepts" which are concepts learned through interaction with adults or more knowledgeable members of the society (as opposed to "spontaneous"concepts which are acquired through interaction with the physical world). Schwartz (1981) provides an example and an explanation of the relationship between thought and language (his example is based on an example used earlier by Margaret Mead):

> "A child calls an elephant a 'doggy' and is told 'No dear, that's not a doggy that's an elephant," ...I would suggest that in the process of substituting culturally correct category delimitations for its initial categorizations the child is learning in increments,"Don't think for yourself Culture will think for you" (p.)

Agar (197) and Halliday (n.d.) similarly discuss this relationship between thought and language, suggesting that not only is thought acquired through lexical categorizations of nouns (as suggested above in Schwartz's example), but also through verbs, and, through language's ability to be situation specific and general at the same time,

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN A SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON

Having discussed my goals for pursuing research in this area, and, having outlined some of my theoretical assumptions, I can now turn to describing

the nature of written language within one classroom. First, I will present a surface level description that includes a discussion of the teacher's perception of the nature of the lesson. Then, I will present a microanalytical description of the lesson, which will include a brief discussion of the microanalytic methodology.

2.1 THE SURFACE LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON

The lesson discussed below occurred on March 4. The lesson consisted of seven segments. Some of the segments consisted of sub-segments. These segments and sub-segments were determined by replaying a videotape of the lesson to the teacher and discussing the lesson with him. These segments and sub-segments are show below.

I. Pre-Lesson

II. Getting Attention

III. Motivation

IV. Instruction

- A. Introduction and Rationale
- B. Preparation for Instruction
- C. Instruction

V. Review

VI. Test

- A. Transition to Test
- B. Introduction to the Test
- C. Coat Rule
- D. Test Beginning
- E. Test Body

F. Test Cover Sheet Rule

G. Test - Move Up

H. Test Finish

I. Test Collection

VII. Feedback

The students entered the classroom, talking with each other and taking their assigned seats (prelesson segment). The teacher moved to the front of the room and called for the class to give him their attention (getting attention segment). The teacher then lectured and discussed school assignment changes, deficiency slips, grades, and, grade responsibilities (motivation segment). Books were distributed, the students were informed about the quiz at the end of the period, and, engaged in a question-answer-discussion activity about the topics on the quiz (instruction segment). After all of the topics were discussed the students were given a short time to independently study for the quiz (review segment). The test was shown on the overhead projector (test segment). After the test was collected, the teacher told the students what the correct answers were (feedback segment).

The social studies teacher viewed the lesson as essentially a "reading lesson." He told me that most of the content of the lesson was of little use to the students. He wanted the students to learn to use reading to answer questions, and, he wanted them to be successful in a classroom event that involved the use of reading. The need for student success was based on his view that these students were constantly being presented with failure and that they needed to be shown that they could be successful on an academic task requiring reading.

The students, seventh graders, had been selected for this class because their most recent scores on the Standford Diagnostic Reading Test placed them in the lower thirty-three percentile on either vocabulary or reading comprehension. Most of the students had participated in Title I, compensatory programs in their elementary schools.

2.2 THE MICROANALYTIC DESCRIPTION OF THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON

In this section, I would like to share the microanalytic description of 3 different written language events from this social studies classroom. Although there were more than three written language events in this lesson, there is insufficient space to discuss all of the written language events in this paper. Before presenting the microanalytic description, however, I would like to briefly discuss the nature of research methodology and the nature of the microanalytic methodology.

2.21 THE NATURE OF THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: SOCIOLINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY

A sociolinguistic ethnography involves the capturing of the communicative processes involved in naturally occurring face-to-face interactions. The intent of a sociolinguistic ethnography is to generate grounded hypotheses about the patterns of communicative behavior involved in the construction of events at the level of face-to-face interaction.

The methodology used in a sociolinguistic ethnographic study consists of ethnographic techniques such as participant observation, field notes, ethnographic interviewing, audio taping, video taping, and the collection of artifacts.

The analytic techniques are used to provide context-bound descriptions of the functions, forms, and meanings of the language participants used in order to communicate their intentions. Thus, the analytic techniques attempt to describe the nature of the social and/or communicative processes as they actually occurred within the face-to-face event.

There are two types of validity involved in sociolinguistic ethnographic research: internal validity and external validity. Internal validity is based on the recurrence of patterns of social and communicative behavior within analogous events. External validity is based on the verification of the patterns of social and communicative behavior by the participants to the event.

The end result of a sociolinguistic ethnography is a series of models of social and/or communicative behavior. These models provide grounded hypotheses for further research, and, also provide grounded theoretical constructs for theory building.

2.22 THE NATURE OF THE MICROANALYTIC DESCRIPTION

The microanalytic methodology can be viewed as consisting of three sets of processes: 1)the identification of social message units,2) the identification of message ties (the structural and thematic cohesion of the discourse), and 3) the identification of patterns of social behavior.

The identification of social message units consists of identifying the boundaries of the basic messages that make up a conversation. Discussion of the identification of social message units is discussed at length in Green and Wallat (1981). Briefly, a social message unit is identified through the use of contextualization cues (Gumperz 1976) which are nonverbal, verbal, and, paralinguistic signals used by participants to communicate and interpret meaning. Nonverbal and prosodic cues (such as rhythm, intonation, posturing, stress patterns, eye gaze) are used in identifying the boundaries of the social message units.

The identification of message ties consists of identifying the structural and thematic relationship of messages to each other. Ties between messages are determined on the basis of explicit verbal cues, nonverbal cues, prosodic cues, contingency of messages, and/or congurency of messages. Usually, there is a redundancy of cues indicating a message tie. However, regardless of the cues signalling a message tie, the making of a message tie always involves the making of a inference. This is true not only for the participant observor or researcher reviewing videotapes, but also for the participants themselves. Frederickson (1981) suggests that three types of inferences are used: macrostructural inferences (ties between a message unit and a hierarchial concept not necessarily explicitly stated in the discourse), extensive inferences (ties between message units and background experience not necessarily explicitly stated in the conversational discourse), and, connective inferences (ties between the message units of a conversational discourse). Further discussion about the nature of message ties can be found in Frederickson (1981) and Green and Wallat (1981).

The identification of patterns of social behavior stems from the internal valdiity component of type case analysis. Once a pattern is identified, the corpus of data is searched for recurrence of the pattern. That is, the pattern is used as a model for prediction of social behavior in analogous situations within the corpus of data. If the model provides predictability in analogous situations, then the pattern of social behavior is said to have internal validity. The initial identification of the pattern occurs through repeated viewing of the corpus of videotapes, identification of an event that seems to be of research interest consistent with the researcher's goals, and then, through the identification of social message units and the identification of message ties and the thematic and structural cohesion.

2.23 MICROANALYTIC PATTERNS OF WRITTEN LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR FROM A SOCIAL STUDIES LESSON

In this section, the microanalytic description of three written language events within the social studies lesson are presented. Full discussion of the nature of the analysis is not possible here, but can be found in Bloome(1981). The three written language events are related, and, their relationship will become clear as the discussion of the events progresses. Following the description of the events, implications of the descriptions will be presented.

2.231 WRITTEN LANGUAGE DURING INSTRUCTION

The following interaction (see next page) occurred during the instructional segment of the lesson. The teacher had announced that the nine questions written on the blackboard were nearly the same as nine of the ten questions on the quiz. The students had already received their textbooks, and, were sitting at their assigned seats with their textbooks open. One of the questions on the blackboard was: "Where is the piedmont in relation to the mountains?"

(The instructional conversation shown on the next page is divided into message units. Each numbered line represents one message unit. As discussed earlier, each message unit was determined through identification of the contextualization cues that indicated message unit boundaries. These contextualization cues have not been indicated on the transcript. Interrater reliability in identifying message units during the social studies lesson was aproximately .91. Such an interrater reliability coefficient is consistent with that found by other researchers conducting similar types of analyses.)

Sampe One

1.	Teacher:	Alright
2.		Where is the piedmont in relation to the mountains
3.		Look at the right hand column on page 81
4.		Near the bottom
5.		Where is the piedmont in relation to the mountains
6.	Several Students:	00000000.....0000000000
7.		XXXXXXXX(undecipherable)XXXXXXXX
8.	Teacher:	You're not reading
9.		Sir
10.		Where is it
11.		You got a hand up sir
12.	First Student:	Oh
13.	Teacher:	Where is it
14.	Unidentified:	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
15.	Teacher	Where is it
16	Several Students:	0000000000000.....0000000000
17.	Teacher:	Where is the piedmont in relation to the mountains
18.		Who knows for sure John
19.	John:	Lies along the coast
20.	Teacher:	Mmmmmmmmmm.....no
21.		Look at that right hand column
22.		Harry
23.	Harry:	Oh...a...a
24.	Teacher:	Where is it
25.	Harry:	The waterline
26.		Near the waterline
27.	Unidentified:	Repeat XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
28.	Teacher	You are not reading it
29.	Second Student:	Mister mister
30.	Several Students:	Mister S_____ repeat it again
31.	Teacher:	Where is the piedmont
32.		Near the mountains yes
33.	Teacher:	You know
34.	Third Student:	West of the piedmont
35.	Fourth Student:	Is it the foot of the mountains
36.	Teacher:	The foot of the mountains
37.		You find that right at the bottom of the second last paragraph on the on the on page 81
38.	Unidentified:	I know XXXXXXXXXXX
39.	Teacher:	The piedmont is at the foot
40.	Unidentified:	I knew where it was at
41.	Teacher:	On the mountains
42.		That means at the base of it

While there are many interesting aspects to the above interaction, I would like to focus primarily on those aspects related to written language. On the surface level, written language, in the form of textbooks, provides a primary source of information that students can use in answering the teacher's questions. However, when one looks beyond the surface level one sees that written language does more than merely provide students with a source of information. In order to look beyond the surface level, one needs to examine the patterns of social and communicative behavior.

An analysis of the referents involved in the above classroom interaction revealed a recurrent pattern; a pattern that occurred seven times in this lesson and frequently in other classroom lessons. The pattern was extracted by first breaking the instructional conversation into social message units through procedures described by Green and Wallat (1979, 1980). Then, each message unit was charted as to its reference to 1) the instructional goal or task, 2) classroom procedures, 3) print, 4) social status 5) race, or 6) other. These categories were chosen as a result of long-term participant observation and informal interviewing with students and the teachers as the most prevelant conversational themes occurring in classrooms. The charting of social message units to one or more of these themes was based on either an explicit verbal reference, a nonverbal cue, a prosodic cue, and/or, the congruency-adjacency of a social message unit.

The general pattern of references in the above sample, and, in analogous samples was:

A. Reference to the <u>instructional goal</u> or task.

B. Reference to <u>print</u>.

C. Reference to the <u>instructional goal</u> or task.

D. References to both <u>instructional goal or task</u> <u>and classroom</u>

procedures.

E. Reference to instructional goal or task.

The teacher states the instructional task (line 2: finding out where the piedmont is in relation to the mountains). He then tells what page and column the students should look at (lines 3 and 4). The instructional task is restated (line 5). This is followed by a series of messages concerned with classroom procedures and/or restatements of the instructional goal (I will argue below that the restatements of the instructional task during this section is actually part of the orchestration of student bids for turns and elicitation of student response. Finally, after the instructional task has been appropriately completed, the instructional goal is restated.

When one looks at the number of message units within each section of the pattern described above one finds the following:

- the initial reference to the instructional task contained one message unit;
- the reference to printed discourse contained two message units;
- the second reference to the instructional goal contained one message unit;
- references to classroom procedures and the instructional task section contained thrity-two message units;
- the final reference to the instructional goal or task contained five message units.

When one looks at the nature of the references to reading, outside of lines #3 and 4, one finds the following:

- on line # 8, the teacher tells the students that they are not reading, suggesting that the students must behave as if they have read and/or are reading before they can answer the question;

- on line #21, the teacher redirects the students' attention to the right hand column, which is essentially a procedure statement;
- on line # 28, the teacher tells them again that they are not reading, suggesting that because they are not coming up with the appropriate answer and/or are not behaving as if they are reading, that they are not reading.

There are several points that can be made about this segment of classroom interaction, at this point. First, the emphasis seems placed on procedural aspects for completing the instructional task. If students follow the outline procedure, then they are expected to get the appropriate answer. Second, reading is viewed, it seems, as essentially a procedure. One is to look at an appropriate line and one knows the answer. The nature of these procedures is highlighted through ensuing interactions. The blackboard questions are sequenced exactly as the information is sequenced. Each question requires the students to "read" within the next one or two paragraphs. Thus, even the transition from one segment of classroom interaction (like the one described above) to the next situation is structured through an overt set of procedures. After several similar classroom interactions, many of the students have picked up the structure involved in making the transitions. This is made evident when the teacher violates the established procedures and requires a response that is not located within the usual area but is located on the next page. Many of the students look at the wrong page, and, it is only when the teacher restates what page that they are to look at do these students finally find the correct page.

It should also be noted that several students in the class are "masking" reading. They are "faking" it. They follow the required "visible" behaviors of looking at the book and flipping pages, having the appropriate postural behavior, and so forth, but they are often on the wrong page and seem to have only a minimal idea about what the instructional task is, or, what the appropriate answer might be.

(A detailed description of one student's "masking" behavior is provided in Bloome, 1981).

One of the interesting aspects of the instructional segment above is the nature of its structural and thematic cohesion. Essentially, from message unit # 2 to 37, the students and the teacher work with and build upon each others' messages until they have the task completed and a shift in the nature of the interaction occurs (at lines #36 to 38). This is similar to what Green and Wallat (1980) and McDermott (1977) found in their studies in that both teacher and students work together towards the accomplishment of instructional or other goals (as defined within the instructional context).

2.232 WRITTEN LANGUAGE DURING THE REVIEW SEGMENT

Before discussing the implications of the patterns of written language behavior in the instructional segment (as described above) several other segments of classroom situations need to be described. After the instructional segment of the lesson, the teacher told the students that they had a brief period to review the balckboard questions. During this time, many students sharpened pencils or bought pencils from the teacher. Some students quietly talked and joked with each other, often getting out of their seats. One student's behavior during this period is particularly interesting. Ann's behavior, while not typical of most of the students during this time, was typical of the behavior of many students during this lesson and other analogous situations.

During the review segment Ann did not make any verbal comments except for a request to collect the books at the beginning of the review segment. The only observable behavior of Ann during this period was her nonverbal behavior (Ann does make some "mouthings" - moving of her lips - but does not make any sounds that could be heard by anyone other than herself). The example below is typical of Ann's behavior during this segment.

1. (looks at the open page in the book)
2. (Flips some pages in the book, stops at one page)
3. (Flips some pages in the book, stops at one page)
4. (Flips some pages in the book, stops at one page)
5. (Flips some pages in the book, stops at one page)
6. (Grabs some of the pages of the book, holding them vertically)
7. (Looks at students in the front of the room)
8. (Looks at the open page in the book, then flips some pages)
9. (Stops flipping pages and looks at a page in the book)
10. (Points with her finger to a place on the page)
11. (While looking at the page, mouths)
12. (Looks at camera)
13. (Looks at page)
14. (Mouths while looking at page)
15. (Looks at camera)
16. (Grabs book pages and holds them vertically)
17. (Writes on the table between her body and the book)
18. (Mouths while writing)
19. (Stops writing but looks at writing)
20. (Writes on table)

The typical pattern of Ann's nonverbal behavior is shown below:

A. Looking at the book

B. Looking up at students or the camera

C. Using pages or arm to shield an area between the book and her body

D. Writing on the table.

E. Looking at the writing on the table.

F. Erasing or writing on the table.

Ann seemed to do a lot of erasing of her writing on the table. The erasing would be followed by either looking back at the book - at the same page she had been looking at - or, it would be followed by more writing on the table. Towards the end of the review segment the pattern changed slightly. Ann frequently omitted looking up at other students or the camera. This was especially true after the teacher announced that there was only two minutes left to the review segment.

Ann's behavior during the Review segment (above) needs to be viewed in the context of her behavior during the test segment. During the text, Ann's behavior followed the pattern below:

A. Look at the test projected on the back wall;

B. Look at the table writing (Ann had written on the table during the review segment, as described earlier);

c. Look at the paper she was using as an answer sheet;

D. Write or erase on the paper;

E. Look at the paper again.

For Ann, during the test segment, written language was used not only to ask and answer questions, but was also used to provide the information for answering questions.

An analysis of Ann's behavior must begin with a distinction between Ann's communication during the review and test segment, versus, her communication in response to the test questions. Ann's nonverbal behavior during the test and review segment effectively communicated appropriate participation. Otherwise she would've been sanctioned for violating the rules for appropriate social behavior by either the teacher or by other students. Beyond the surface level of signalling appropriate participation, Ann is engaging in a pattern of communicative behavior analogous to the pattern of behavior involved in the instructional segment:

a. she looks at the instructional task (test question);

b. she looks at the printed discourse (table writing);

c. she follows a series of classroom procedures (such as writing the letter of the answer and/or erasing and/or covering her paper);

d. she looks at the original instructional task (she looks back at her paper).

Just as in the instructional segment where there was a series of missed attempts to complete the instructional goal, so too, are there a series of missed attempts in

getting the correct (or what is hoped will be the correct) answer written on the paper. Ann often has to write, erase, and, rewrite a series of times before she goes on to the next question.

One might mistakenly assume that Ann's use of these procedures (described above) or patterns provides here with a means for correctly answering questions. However, her low grade on this test (she missed all but two multiple choice questions out of nine multiple choice questions; and, she missed all but one state out of six states that she was supposed to be able to identify and write correctly) and her behavior during the feedback section suggest otherwise. During the feedback section, Ann -who is now sitting with other students - proclaims verbally and nonverbally that she "got that one right" each time the teacher reviews a question and the appropriate answer. She holds up a finger for each answer and jumps up and down in her chair saying "I got that one" and so forth. In effect, Ann behaves as if she got them correct so that the other people in the classroom will think that she did get them correct, I presume.

2.3 DISCUSSION OF THE MICROANALYTIC PATTERNS

When one takes a look at Ann's behavior, it seems as if she has learned patterns of surface level behavior that allow her to appropriately participate in some written language events without necessarily having to use written language to effectively communicate over space and time (using written language to communicate over space and time has been defined by several researchers as the essential function of writing). It also appears that Ann has learned a pattern of written language behavior, possibly derived from her participation in instructional segments such as the one described in this paper, but, she has learned them procedurally and not substantively. That is, she has learned the procedures of the patterns but it seems she has not learned how to use the patterns using written language to communicate across space and time. It seems as if the written language communicative

competence that Ann has learned allows her to 1)appropriately participate in classroom events, while 2) fail to answer correctly content questions.

The concepts of reading that Ann and her classmates encounter in the lesson, especially in the instructional segment (as well as in other segments of the lesson not reviewed in this paper), suggest that reading and/or written language is, in effect, a set of procedures one enacts. One follows a set of procedures and then one has been reading and/or using written language.

3.0 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

I have not been able, in this paper, to discuss the nature of the forms of written language in this classroom. However, this component of learning the written language of the classroom also needs to be considered in addition to the other two components: written language communicative competence, and, learning about the written language of the classroom. Nor, have I been able to describe some other written language situations that repeatedly occur in this lesson and/or in other observed classrooms that do not follow the patterns I have described above. However, both the nature of the forms of written language and other written language events seem consistent, thematically with the issues and situations I've discussed earlier.

The implications of this look at written language in the classroom are similar to implications suggested by DeStefano, Pepinsky, and, Sanders' (1981) study of a first grade classroom. They noted that the language of classroom literacy events was essentially procedural, and, that although students did not necessarily improve their literacy skills, they did learn the procedures. The implications of my work suggest that researchers need to examine the possibility that in some classrooms, perhaps in some schools, the learning of written language is equivalent to the learning of procedures and patterns of social behavior that do not provide children with the ability to use written language to communicate across space and time effectively nor in a manner consistent with the expectations that most educators would have regarding written language.

When the patterns of written language behavior described in this paper are viewed from the perspective of the learning of "thought" (discussed earlier), then other implications can be suggested as avenues for further research. The "thought" that students may be learning is the equating of written language with a set of patterns of social behavior. That is, students learned language, in this study classroom written language, as social form. The social form has a social function. This can be contrasted with viewing written language as having a content that has a social function embedded within a social form. The suggestion is that students learn a "cultural stance" towards written language and communication in general, into which they are enculturated. Further research is needed in order to understand both the nature of the erculturation process and the nature of the written language into which children are enculturated.

Agar, Micahel. "Talking about Doing: Lexicon and Event," Language in Society, 3, 197 , pp. 83-89.

Apple,M., and, King, N. "What Do Schools Teach?" in, J. MacDonald, and, W. Gephart (eds.) Humanism and Education. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.

Bloome, David. Microanalysis Across Questions and Contexts: Looking at a Social Studies Lesson. Workshop presented at Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Philadelphia, March 1981.

Bloome, David, and, Judith Green. "Reading as a Social Process: Evidence from Sociolinguistic and Ethnographic Studies," in, B. Hutson (ed.) Advances in Reading/Language Research. Greenwich, Ct.: J.A.I. Press, in press.

Cazden, Courtney, Vera Johnm and, Dell Hymes. Functions of Language in the Classroom. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1972,

Cole, M. An Ethnographic Psychology of Cognition. Paper at Conference on the Interface between Culture and Learning, Honolulu, February 1972.

Cole, M., and, Scribner,S. "Theorizing about Socialization of Cognition," in, T.Schwartz (ed.) Socialization as Cultural Communication. L.A.: University of California Press, 1979.

Collins, J., and, Michaels, S. "The Importance of Conversational Discourse Strategies in the Acquisition of Literacy," Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, 1980.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny. "Persausive Talk: The Social Organization of Children's Talk," in J. green, and, C. Wallat (eds.) Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. N.J.: Ablex, 1981.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, and, John Gumperz. "From Oral to Written Culture: The Transition to Literacy," to be published in M. Whiteman (ed.) Variation in Writing. N.Y.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1978.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, and, John Gumperz. "Context in Children's Speech," Papers on Language and Context: Working Paper #46. Berkeley: Language Behavior Research Laboratory, 1976.

DeStefano, J., Pepinsky, H., and, Sanders, T. Discourse Rules for Literacy Learning in a Classroom. Paper for Conference on Communicating in the Classroom, Madison, Wisconsin, 1981

Erickson, F. Timing and Context in Everyday Discourse: Implications for the Study of Referential and Social Meaning. Paper at Conference on Children's Oral Communication Skills, Madison, Wisconsin, 1978.

Erickson, F., and, Shultz, J. "When is a Context? Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence," in J. Green, and, C. Wallat (eds.). Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. N.J.:Ablex, 1981

Erickson, Frederick, and, Jeffery Shultz. "When is a Context? Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence," Quaterly Newsletter of the Institute for Comparative Human Development, 1 (2), February 1977.

Florio, S., and, Shultz, J. Social Competence at Home and at School. Paper at American Anthropological Association Meeting, L.A., 1978.

Frederickson, C. "Inference in Preschool Children's Conversations: A Cognitive Perspective," in J. Green, and, C. Wallat (eds.). Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. N.J.: Ablex, 1981

Green, J., and, Wallat, C (eds.). Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. N.J.: Ablex, 1981

Green, J., and, Wallat, C. "What is an Instructional Context? An Exploratory Analysis of Conversational Shifts Across Time," in, O. Garnica and M. King (eds.) Language, Children, and Society. N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1979.

Gumperz, J. "Language,Communication, and, Public Negotiation," draft of article to appear in P. Sanday (ed.) Anthroplogy and the Public Interest. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1976.

Gumperz, J. "Conversational Inference and Classroom Learning," in J. Green, and, C. Wallat (eds.). Ethnogrpahy and Language in Educational Settings. N.J.: Ablex Press, 1981

Halliday,M. "Talking One's Way In," in, A. Davies(ed.) Problems of Language and Learning. London: Heineman, 1975.

Halliday,M. Language as a Social Semiotic: Towards a General Sociolinguistic Theory. Draft of article to appear in A. Makkai et. al. (eds.) Linguistics at the Crossroads. The Hague: Mouton (no date given).

Halliday, Michael. Untitled sppech given at N.C.T.E./I.R.A. Impact Conference on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction. St. Louis, May 1980.

Heap, James. "What Counts as Reading?" Curriculum Inquiry. Winter 1980.

Hymes,D. Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Phil.: University of Penn. Press, 1974.

McDermott, R.P. Kids Make Sense: An Ethnographic Account of the Interactional Management of Success and Failure in One First Grade Classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.

Mehan, H. "What Time Is It Denise? Some Observations on the Organization and Consequences of Asking Known Information Questions in Classroom Discourse,"Theory Into Practice, 18(4), 1979.

Michaels, S. Sharing Time. Paper at Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Phil., 1980.

Mishler, E. "Implications of Teahcer Strategies for Language nad Cognition: Observations in First Grade Classrooms," in, C. Cazden, V. John, and, D. Hymes (eds.) Functions of Language in the Classroom. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Schwartz, T. "The Acquisition of Culture," Ethos, 9(1), Spring 1981, pp. 4-17.

Scollon, Ron, and,Suzanne Scollon,

Tannen, D. Implications of the Oral/Literate Continuum for Cross Cultural Communication. Paper at 31st Georgetown Round Table on Language and Linguistics, 1980.

Vygotsky,L. Mind in Society. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978.

Vygotsky,L. Thought and Language. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1962.